The meeting began at 8:00 a.m.

The Chair welcomed the Committee.

Before voting on the Consent Agenda, the Chair noted that the effective dates for Item 3 would be Fall 2016 (and that the forms were accordingly amended). He also emphasized that the changes reflected in Item 1b were to correct an error, and that no requirements were changing.

The following items remained on the Consent Agenda and were unanimously approved.

Consent Agenda:

1. College of Aeronautics
   b. CGR - Minor in Unmanned Aerial Systems

2. Dept. of Civil Engineering
   a. CRC - CVE 4073 - Construction Cost Engineering
   b. CRC - CVE 4074 - Leading Construction Operations

College of Science
3. Dept. of Mathematical Sciences
   a. ANC - MTH 4202 - Stochastic Modeling
   b. CGR - B.S. Mathematical Sciences - Applied Mathematics
   c. CGR - B.S. Mathematical Sciences

Consent Agenda Discussion Items:

The following item was discussed and unanimously tabled.

1. College of Aeronautics
   a. ANC - AHF 1101 - Introduction to Aviation Psychology

A comment was made that there was no textbook listed on the syllabus, an item the Committee generally requests, however it was pointed out that the proposed textbook was, in fact, on the syllabus.

It was also commented that, in the experience of the School of Psychology, freshmen do not always perform well in psychology courses that present topics more advanced than those presented in PSY 1411 (Introduction to Psychology) without having already been through PSY 1411. As such, it was suggested that, even though this is a 1000-level course, PSY 1411 might be listed as a prerequisite course to AHF 1101, depending on when AHF 1101 appeared in the program. Since there was no pressing need to pass the course, Mr. I. Cremer (substituting for Ms. V. Dunbar for the College of Aeronautics) agreed to bring the suggestion back for further discussion within the college.
Discussion Items:

1. Update to “Policies and Procedures” document. (Dr. Archambault)

The Chair explained that shortly after the previous meeting, it had been noted that the Committee’s “Policies and Procedures” document was inconsistent with recent policy changes related to when curricula changes would become effective, and that he was proposing modifications to the relevant text. In addition, he noted that he made other minor changes, including updating Dr. D. McCay’s title from “provost” to “Executive Vice President/Chief Operating Officer,” removing references to a “printed” University Catalog, and correcting the name of a form. It was asked if the UGCC continues to report to Dr. McCay or if it reports to Dr. Koksal (Vice-President of Academic Affairs). In response, it was explained that the Committee was formed as an advisory committee for the chief academic officer, who in recent history has been Dr. McCay (having previously held the title “Provost”), and though he may have delegated some responsibility to the Office of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs related to it, ultimately the Committee continues to report to Dr. McCay.

The Chair moved that the proposed changes to the “Policies and Procedures” document be accepted, and they were unanimously approved.

2. Implementation of both MTH 1011 (Precalculus A) and MTH 1012 (Precalculus B) in the same semester. (Dr. Abdulla)

The Chair explained that when the Committee approved the new courses MTH 1011 and MTH 1012, we were told that the possibility existed that some highly-motivated students may take both courses (sequentially) within a single semester, and now this has occurred with four students this semester. However, there had been some confusion as to whether these students were meeting all the requirements of MTH 1011 as approved by the Committee, particularly the number of contact hours required to receive three credits, and that the Registrar’s Office, Dr. M. Baloga (Vice-President for Institutional Effectiveness), and Dr. U. Abdulla (Dept. Head of Mathematical Sciences) had asked to address the Committee on this matter.

Dr. Abdulla began by reminding the Committee of the history of creating MTH 1011 and 1012, followed by the newly-established criteria students must meet in order to take both MTH 1011 and 1012 in the same semester, including passing a final exam by the sixth week with a score of at least 90% in MTH 1011, attending MTH 1012 from the beginning of the semester, and fulfilling all the lecture and laboratory contact hours. He noted that the four students permitted to continue on to MTH 1012 this semester, though they are performing well, did not meet all the contact hours, prompting the new criteria, and that the students are being required to complete additional lab hours right up through the term’s “study days” and final exam week. He also noted that the Dept. of Mathematical Sciences is working to improve the program by relying less on the software used by the students, and including more instructor interaction.

Dr. Baloga noted that she felt this was a good model for remedial courses, in part because it should be a goal to get students caught up on remedial work as quickly as possible, but was requesting that the Committee discuss refining the definition of a credit hour to include an accommodation for courses that are obviously competency-based.

It was commented that having the students take a final exam for which they must achieve 90% is a lot like having them take an equivalency exam, and could that not be the solution? The response was “no,” that
University policy does not permit a student to take an equivalency exam for a course in which they are registered after the first week of classes.

A question was asked as to which courses such a competency-based credit definition would be applied, and would it not require that such courses be designated as “remedial?” This led to a discussion as to which courses were considered “remedial,” and several other questions. Why do some “remedial” courses result in academic credit, and others do not? If a student enters the University having tested out of a “remedial” course that would have resulted in the award of academic credit, why should those students not receive the same academic credit, perhaps for use as free elective? Are all “remedial” courses competency-based, and should they be called “remedial?” Dr. Baloga suggested the Committee should investigate these questions, perhaps through a subcommittee, and she indicated that she would like to have the Committee offer recommendations on what, if any, changes to the credit hour definition should be adopted, and how they should be implemented. The Chair suggested that the Committee should make a decision at its next regular meeting to either form a subcommittee, or resolve the issues as a whole, with the goal of being able to make the requested recommendations by the end of the Spring semester.

Returning to the four students who did not meet all the required contact hours, and the comment that they are being required to complete lab hours during the “study days,” it was pointed out that nothing can be required of the students during those days. With this in mind, Dr. Abdulla agreed not to require the students to attend during these days, but that the lab would be open and that they could attend voluntarily if they wished.

The Chair noted the next meeting, and wish everyone a happy holiday season.

Our next regular meeting is Fri., Jan. 30 at 8:00 a.m. in the Physical Sciences conference room. Agenda items are due Fri., Jan. 23.

The meeting ended at 8:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Archambault – Chair